

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment and the following remarks are intended to fully respond to the Office Action mailed July 9, 2008. In that Office Action, claims 1-20 were examined, and all claims were rejected. More specifically, claims 8-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 for being indefinite; claims 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter; claims 1-6, 8-11, and 13-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,678,714 to Olapurath et al. (Olapurath) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,203,947 to Shaffer (Shaffer); claims 7 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olapurath in view of Shaffer in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,076,106 to Hamner (Hamner); claims 18-19 were rejected in view of Olapurath in view of Hamner; and claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olapurath and Hammer in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,678,889 to Burkett et al. (Burkett). Reconsideration of these rejections, as they might apply to the original and amended claims in view of these remarks, is respectfully requested.

In this response, claim 18 has been amended and claims 8-12 have been canceled. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 8-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 for being indefinite. In response to this rejection, claims 8-12 have been canceled.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 for being allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Although Applicant maintains that the subject matter of claim 18 was allowable prior to this current amendment, in the interest of furthering prosecution, Application has amended claim 18 to recite a processor and a memory. This rejection is now moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-6, 8-11, and 13-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Olapurath in view of Shaffer.

The Office Action states that Olapurath "...does not clearly disclose receiving information from a first resource related to a first task, wherein the information received from the first resource indicates whether the first resource is used to perform the management task; receiving information from a second resource related to a second task, wherein the information received from the second resource indicates whether the second resource is used to perform the management task." (Office Action, pg. 5). Applicants agree.

In order to make up for the deficiencies of Olapurath, the Office Action relies on Shaffer. However, Shaffer does not qualify as prior art. The present application was filed on December 11, 2001 but claims priority to a number of provisional applications filed on December 11, 2000. Shaffer was filed on October 31, 2001 and therefore does not qualify as prior art and cannot be combined in the manner suggested in the Office Action to render claims 1-6, 8-11 and 13-17 obvious. For at least these reasons, claims 1-6, 8-11, and 13-17 are allowable over the recited combination of references.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olapurath in view of Shaffer and in further view of Hamner. As discussed, Shaffer does not qualify as prior art, therefore cannot be combined in the manner suggested in the Office Action to render claim 7 obvious. Therefore, for at least this reason, claim 7 is allowable over the recited combination of references.

Claims 18-19 were rejected in view of Olapurath in view of Hamner.

Claim 18 recites in part:

identifying a plurality of resources which are in communication with a management module wherein each of the resources are configured to provide information corresponding to the management of a plurality of objects associated with each of the resources, wherein at least one of the plurality of objects is a user object that contains information corresponding to a network user, and wherein the management module is capable of receiving a request to access the information related to one or more of the

plurality of resources and to receive task information from the
plurality of resources related to their associated objects

Neither Olapurath nor Hamner disclose or suggest the above recited element of claim 18.

Olapurath discloses a system and method that provides a “single environment to provide task related services.” (Olapurath, col. 1, lines 36-38). As part of this system, Olapurath discloses that in response to certain events (e.g., a new employee being hired), certain tasks may need to be performed. For example, a new computer must be given to the new employee, a new cubicle assigned to the new employee etc. (See Olapurath, col. 3, lines 10-19). According to Olapurath, a task is “...a unit of work that is requested by a “Requestor” and fulfilled by a “Fulfiller.” Tasks are active elements.” (Olapurath, col. 2, lines 46-48). Olapurath continues by defining a Fulfiller as a person or software object that requests the execution of a task or task group” and a Requestor as “a person or software object that request the execution of a task or task group”. (See Olapurath, col. 2, lines 52-56). When a task is to be performed, the task server provides the facility to define tasks. Once the tasks are defined the tasks are stored in task memory for later retrieval and fulfillment at the request of a task requestor. (See Olapurath, col. 3, lines 52-56).

Olapurath does not disclose “a management module *in communication with the plurality of resources*, wherein each of the *resources are configured to provide information corresponding to the management of a plurality of objects* associated with *each of the resources*, wherein *at least one of the plurality of objects is a user object that contains information corresponding to a network user*, and wherein the *management module is capable of receiving a request to access the information related to one or more of the plurality of resources and to receive task information* from the plurality of resources related to their associated objects” as recited in claim 18. Olapurath merely discloses a system and method for assigning tasks to be performed by various task fulfillers.

Hamner discloses a system for providing information on a computer network that includes a number of devices. A number of tasks are provided, such that each task can be performed upon at least one of the devices. Hamner also discloses displaying to a user in a first area, representations corresponding to the devices, and in a second area displaying tasks. A user

first selects a representation and, in response to the user input, information indicating which of the tasks can be performed upon the selected device is displayed in the second area. (See Hamner, col. 1, lines 56-67). Hamner does not however disclose the above-recited elements of claim 18.

Therefore, even if the references could be combined in the manner suggested in the Office Action, the combination would still lack at least the above-recited elements of claim 18. As claim 19 depends from claim 18, claim 19 is not rendered obvious by the recited combination of references.

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olapurath and Hamner in further view of Burkett. Claim 20 depends from claim 18 and therefore contains the above-recited element of claim 18. As discussed neither Olapurath nor Hamner disclose at least the above-recited element of claim 18 and Burkett does not make up for their deficiencies. Therefore, even if the references could be combined in the manner suggested in the Office Action, the combination would still lack at least the above-recited limitation of claim 18. As claim 20 depends from claim 18, claim 20 is not rendered obvious by the recited combination of references.

Conclusion

This Amendment fully responds to the Office Action mailed on July 9, 2008. Still, that Office Action may contain arguments and rejections and that are not directly addressed by this Amendment because they are rendered moot in light of the preceding arguments in favor of patentability. Hence, failure of this Amendment to directly address an argument raised in the Office Action should not be taken as an indication that the Applicants believe the argument to have merit. Furthermore, the claims of the present application may include other elements, not discussed in this Amendment, which are not shown, taught, or otherwise suggested by the art of record. Accordingly, the preceding arguments in favor of patentability are advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.


The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment with respect to this patent application to deposit account number 13-2725.

In light of the above remarks and amendments, it is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any additional issues need to be resolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attempt to resolve those issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 9, 2008




Greg Johnson, Reg. No. 59,027
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
303.357.1651